REMARKS

The abstract has been amended to an appropriate length and to remove numerical references.

Claim 1 has been amended so as to distinguish further over Urano. As referred to on page 3, lines 17 to 18, in an embodiment of the present invention, "The output of the receiver 16 is fed to a decoder 18. The decoder 18 decodes the bit stream which includes a mode indicator signal from the receiver". From this teaching it is clear that the bit stream sent by the transmitter and received by the receiver includes a mode indicator signal. It is this mode indicator signal that is compared to the output from the first comparator. This has been clarified in amended claim 1, which now requires a mode indicator signal set by the encoder "indicative of whether or not the last macroblock was encoded in inter-frame prediction format".

This clearly distinguishes over Urano which relates to processing at an encoder to produce macroblock information MBT for transmission.

As previously mentioned, claim 1 relates to a receiver whereas the cited portions of Urano relate to transmitters. Specifically, as mentioned in column 3, line 40, Figure 8 shows an encoder, parts of which are described in column 9, lines 21 to 35 and in column 9, lines 50 to 53 in relation to Figure 12, see column 9, lines 37 to 39. Furthermore, column 14, lines 57 to 60, which relate to Figures 17 and 21, see column 12, lines 51 to 52 and column 3, lines 59 to 65, also relates to an encoder.

Also, dispersion value comparator 232 in Figure 12 appears to compare outputs from four different dispersion value calculators 216, 226, 228, 230 so as to choose between three different types of inter-frame prediction compression or none during encoding, see column 10 line 52 to column 11 line 2. This is in contrast to the present invention which concerns decompression and decoding at a receiver, involving comparison of current and previous frames to determine whether interframe-prediction format was applied or not, and comparison of the result with a mode indicator signal received from the transmitter in order to detect errors.

Furthermore, for completeness, the passage cited in column 14, lines 57 to 60 does not teach comparison of that result with a mode indicator signal received from the

transmitter and indicative of whether or not inter-frame prediction was applied in compression before transmission. Also, column 14 lines 57 to 60 relates to a different system to that shown in Figure 12.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 were indicated as being rejected under 35 USC 102. However, no reasoning was provided as to how the extra features referred to in those dependent claims were disclosed by Urano. Nevertheless, this is believed to now be moot, as these claims 2, 3 and 5 now depend on what is believed to be an allowable amended base claim, and so are allowable not least on that basis.

Claim 4 is believed to be allowable not least on the basis that it is believed to depend on an allowable claim 1.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance. In the event of any fees inadvertently omitted or any improper payment of fees, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No.12-2325 to correct the error now or during the pendency of this application.

If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone conversation would be helpful, please contact Julio Garceran at (908) 582-7294.

Respectfully submitted,

Faruk Mehmet Eryurtlu

By: _____
Julio A. Garceran, Attorney
Reg. No. 37,138

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 4/21/05